

RECEIVED

MAY 10 2017

BY MAIL

MAY 8<sup>th</sup> 2017

The Honorable Judge Nannette A. Baker  
United States Magistrate Judge  
Thomas F. Eagleton US Court House  
111 South 10<sup>th</sup> Street  
St. Louis, MO 63102

Dear Judge Baker,

This is Tommy Anderson case # 4:14CR246 AGF/NAB respectfully requesting your attention to the per-usual lying/deceitful statements of the US Attorney's Office for the Eastern District of Missouri made directly to you, in your own court room. These statements were designed to manipulate the interfaces you would draw on critical issues specifically, with respect to the unauthorized/undisclosed electronic surveillance of my AT&T I-Phone account #523182897652 phone number 831-582-7847. As the Supreme Court recognizes the full protections of the 4<sup>th</sup> Amendment apply to cell phones. Likewise, Federal and State Courts have held that people have a reasonable expectation of privacy, particularly in their cell phone location information. Even the F.B.I concurred in a official public statement explaining, "Defendants have a legal right to challenge the use of electronic surveillance devices, and by not disclosing their use could inappropriately and adversely effect a defendants right to challenge the use of the equipment."

Significantly Geo-location information obtained thru these unlawful intercepts was disclosed at my August 27<sup>th</sup>, 2014 detention hearing in testimony by DEA Agent Alexander Jenny.

Q: He self-surrendered. So that, obviously, obviated the necessity for your agency or any other agency involved in this investigation to take action to arrest him, correct?

A: At that point, correct, But prior to that there were efforts made by the agency in efforts to LOCATE HIM and, in effect, arrest him because of the unsurety of him, in fact turning himself in.

AUSA John Davis would be much more specific in his re-direct examination Page 33 lines 11-24

Q: Is it true at the same time we had information that he was not out of the country. Is that correct?

A: Correct

Q: In fact he had been Spotted in Monterey, California and in Humboldt County, California at the time Mr. Rosenbloom was relating he was out of the country.

A: That is correct

Again AUSA John Davis would also include this information in a signed pleading December 1<sup>st</sup>, 2014 titled, "Response In Opposition to Defendant Andersons Motion to Revoke Magistrates Detention Order." Page 5 under the heading "Risk of Flight"

"In response and likewise through counsel, the Government proffered Evidence that Anderson was in fact in California at the time of his indictment"

This past week my lawyer Justin Gelfand contacted AUSA John Davis via E-mail requesting Discovery on how or who or what quote, "Spotted" me in these specific locations days before I turned myself in. AUSA Davis answer was that after talking to DEA/FBI agents they collectively have "No idea." I don't expect the Government Actors in this case to admit to violations of USC title 50 which illustrates criminal sanctions follows violations of electronic surveillance by Intentionally

engaging in electronic surveillance under the color of law or through disclosing information known to have been obtained through unauthorized surveillance. The penalties for either act are fines up to US\$10,000, up to 5 years in jail, or both. This issue at a minimum directly relates to Government misconduct, a issue certainly not foreign to all parties, more so, a focal point of countless motions before the court.

On August 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2016 your Honor allowed me to address the US attorney's office under oath oral statements before this court, that there was no electronic surveillance on my AT&T I-Phone, which was the subject of the Conflicts hearing a year earlier. I informed this Honorable Court of a recorded jail house call between AT&T Government Compliance Center and myself that completely contradicts AUSA James Delworth who made those representations. I explained to your honor that given the opportunity I would subpoena the recorded call and provide it to the court for judicial review. It should be noted that the aforementioned call was the only call missing when Warrenton County Jail complied with the subpoena. My sister noticed the automated time stamp of each call and cross referenced our parents phone bill incoming/outgoing calls. She then provided these documents to my lawyer who re-subpoenaed the jail. If it weren't for these efforts I would not have the factual support to prove this letter. Please find enclosed a transcribed copy of this call as well E-mailed the MP3 audio original to the court clerk for any necessary verification. The sender screen name is LauraJo58@yahoo.com it's titled, "AT&T Government Compliance Tommy Anderson"

Honestly, I think AT&T Government Compliance Agent Renaldo thought I was a Federal Agent even though I never identified myself as one. If you would please read the call in its entirety its a smoking gun. Your Honor will notice on the bottom of page 3 of the transcribed call the Governments request for Geo-Location information.

AT&T Agent Renaldo: I do see we had a mobile locate request in July 2014 for that Target number.

Tom Anderson: In July 2014?

AT&T Agent Renaldo: Correct

The reason I called AT&T Government Compliance Center in the first place is I didn't believe US attorney Richard Callahan in his signed pleading. I use to see him at Bar Napoli in Clayton, MO. taking drinks with Scott Rosenbloom. That pleading was Government's Motion for Inquiry Into Potential Conflicts of Interest which states, "The Government has subpoenaed toll records from AT&T that may or may not confirm this along with other calls made at the time." I knew better and AT&T confirmed I was dead on the money. Page 8 transcribed call bottom of page.

Tom Anderson: Okay, perfect! So, and just to confirm though you have not recieved the subpoena for the toll records

AT&T Agent Renaldo: NO

Tom Anderson: For the --- that was submitted in March 2015 for the Information of September 2014, correct?

AT&T Agent Renaldo: That is correct, I'm not seeing any request.

Tom Anderson: And the only thing you have is a Government request from July 2014, Correct? But you cant give any more information until you receive the proper documentation, correct?

AT&T Agent Renaldo: That is Correct.

In sum your Honor I have a legal right to challenge electronic surveillance under the 4<sup>th</sup> Amendment. If the Government was so heavily asserted in Justice I would not have to write letters and go to these extreme lengths. I respectfully request the production

of the July 2014 location request submitted to AT&T as well any other electronic surveillance requests pertaining to Account # 523182897652 connected phone number 831-582-7847. As far as the US attorney himself and the AUSA's in this case representing their efforts to obtain phone records when simply put they did not, demonstrates the Governments deeper knowledge of events. I motioned for this entire US attorney office to be recused because collectively they continue to conceal material evidence related to their possible knowledge or worse involvement in RSRG's extortion of their own client me, I believe not only was this office aware, the US attorney's were complicit. Think about it like this, Who would investigate their own misconduct? Thank you for your time.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tommy Anderson #108852

\* Please add to official Court Record  
with related documents enclosed.  
Thank you court clerk.

\* Please Don't put under seal